



Syddansk Universitet

Erratum to

CoMEt: A statistical approach to identify combinations of mutually exclusive alterations in cancer [Genome Biol., 16, (2015), (160)]

Leiserson, Mark D.M.; Wu, Hsin Ta; Vandin, Fabio; Raphael, Benjamin J.

Published in:
Genome Biology

DOI:
[10.1186/s13059-016-1034-9](https://doi.org/10.1186/s13059-016-1034-9)

Publication date:
2016

Document version
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Document license
CC BY

Citation for pulished version (APA):
Leiserson, M. D. M., Wu, H. T., Vandin, F., & Raphael, B. J. (2016). Erratum to: CoMEt: A statistical approach to identify combinations of mutually exclusive alterations in cancer [Genome Biol., 16, (2015), (160)]. Genome Biology, 17, [168]. DOI: 10.1186/s13059-016-1034-9

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal ?

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

ERRATUM

Open Access



Erratum to: CoMEt: a statistical approach to identify combinations of mutually exclusive alterations in cancer

Mark D. M. Leiserson^{1,2†}, Hsin-Ta Wu^{1,2†}, Fabio Vandin^{1,3} and Benjamin J. Raphael^{1,2*}

Erratum

After the publication of this work [1] it has been brought to our attention that the descriptions of the generation of the two simulated datasets were confusing.

In the section ‘Benchmarking of methods for individual gene sets’, the first sentence of the second paragraph should specify the number of genes included in the gene set as 100, and it should read:

“We compared CoMEt to the other methods on datasets with $m = 100$ genes and $n = 500$ samples and with implanted pathways with coverages γ ranging from 0.1 to 1.0.”

In the section ‘Benchmarking identification of collections of gene sets’, the first paragraph should specify that genes mutated in fewer than 1% of total samples (that is in fewer than 5 out of 500 samples) were removed from the simulation, and the sixth sentence in this paragraph should read:

“Third, we include $m = 20,000$ genes and remove those genes that are mutated in fewer than 1% of total samples (that is in fewer than 5 out of 500 samples) (Additional file 1: Figure S2).”

Additionally, these descriptions are also included in the Additional file 1, section S3, and should read:

“We generated two different versions of the simulated datasets, depending on whether we implanted a single or multiple gene sets. We describe the method for generating datasets with multiple implanted gene sets in the main text. For all simulated datasets, we used $n = 500$, $|C| = 5$, $\gamma_C = (0.67, 0.49, 0.29, 0.29, 0.2)$, and $q = 0.0027538462.1$. We used $\mu_P = (0.5, 0.35, 0.15)$ for the single pathway simulations.”

We also updated the description of our procedure for assessing the convergence of the MCMC algorithm in Additional file 1, section S2, which should read:

“To assess the convergence of the MCMC algorithm, we ran multiple chains with different initializations. For one of these initializations, we used the collection output by Multi-Dendrix [21] (using the same values of the parameters t and k as in CoMEt). The remaining initializations were random collections. We ran the MCMC algorithm with these initializations, running each chain for a given number of iterations. We consider the chains converged if the mean total variation distance between the chains is smaller than 0.005. Otherwise, we increase the number of iterations by a factor of 1.5. We repeat this process until the chains converge or the total number of iterations per chain reaches a maximum number of iterations, which we set as 1 billion. The output of the MCMC algorithm is the union of the sampling distributions from the different initializations.”

The corrected Additional file 1 is included in this Erratum.

Additional file

Additional file 1: Supplementary information. Supplementary results and figures. (PDF 5528 kb)

Author details

¹Department of Computer Science, Brown University, 115 Waterman Street, Providence, RI 02912, USA. ²Center for Computational Molecular Biology, Brown University, Box 1910, Providence, RI 02912, USA. ³Department of Mathematics and Computer Science, University of Southern Denmark, Campusvej 55, Odense M, Denmark.

Received: 28 July 2016 Accepted: 28 July 2016

Published online: 02 August 2016

References

1. Leiserson MDM, Wu H, Vandin F, Raphael BJ. CoMEt: a statistical approach to identify combinations of mutually exclusive alterations in cancer. *Genome Biol.* 2015;16:160.

* Correspondence: braphael@cs.brown.edu

†Equal contributors

¹Department of Computer Science, Brown University, 115 Waterman Street, Providence, RI 02912, USA

²Center for Computational Molecular Biology, Brown University, Box 1910, Providence, RI 02912, USA